



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,062	09/26/2001	Kazuyuki Matsumoto	CU-2676 RJS	1441

26530 7590 05/09/2003

LADAS & PARRY
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1200
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER

WINDMULLER, JOHN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3724

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/964,062

Applicant(s)

MATSUMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

John Windmuller

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1, 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita in view of the Japanese reference to Nishigaito and the British reference 1,074,662. The method of Fujita discloses the invention as claimed except for the method of heating a workpiece, determining its expected expansion, and cutting the workpiece so as to compensate for its expansion when it is cooled; and performing said operation on a synthetic resin sheet. However, Nishigaito teaches a method of heating a workpiece, determining its expected expansion, and cutting the workpiece so as to compensate for its expansion when it is cooled (see translated abstract). Also, the British reference 1,074,662 teaches performing an operation to compensate for expansion during heating of a synthetic resin sheet. While the British reference 1,074,662 does not explicitly teach performing heating with expansion-adjusted cutting on a synthetic resin sheet, it does show that it is well known that a sheet-shaped plastic workpiece is deformed when it undergoes heating processes and it may be desirable to build into the process elements that compensate for this deformation (see claim 1, see also the abstract of the European reference to Guntell et al.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the method of Fujita with the method of heating a workpiece, determining its expected expansion, and cutting the workpiece so as to compensate for its expansion when it is cooled as taught by Nishigaito and the dimensional compensation of a heat-worked synthetic resin sheet as taught by the British reference 1,074,662 for effective dimensional control of the workpiece.

Furthermore, regarding claim 2, it would be obvious to perform steps similar to those described in claim 1 on a synthetic resin sheet having a plurality of prescribed cutting lines since doing so would constitute merely repeating the steps described in claim 1.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2 have been considered but are non-persuasive. In paragraphs 3 and 4 of applicant's remarks, Applicant states that the Japanese reference to Nishigaito relates to cutting a hot-rolled steel bar that has been heated up by thousands of degrees centigrade and so cannot be used against the claims, which describe a method for cutting a synthetic resin sheet, which has been heated up by only tens of degrees centigrade. British reference 1,074,662, which teaches dimensional control of a heat-worked synthetic resin sheet, has been applied to the claims above. Applicant is also referred to the abstract of the European reference to Guntell et al. The claims stand rejected.

In paragraph 5 of applicant's remarks, Applicant states that it would not be obvious to combine the Fujita reference with the Japanese reference to Nishigaito because Fujita uses a rotary cutter and Nishigaito does not. In the current rejection of claims 1 and 2, the controlled rotary cutting of a sheet-shaped material of Fujita is combined with the dimensionally adjusted cutting of a hot-rolled steel bar of Nishigaito and further combined with the dimensional control of a heat-worked synthetic resin sheet of the British reference 1,074,662 to arrive at the Applicant's claimed invention. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Fujita and Nishigaito references because they both disclose cutting operations. The method involving a rotary cutter and sheet-shaped material of Fujita is

modified with the dimensionally adjusted cutting of a hot-rolled steel bar of Nishigaito. It is not necessary for Nishigaito to have a rotary cutter to be combined with Fujita.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Guntell et al., Kurimoto, Yasue et al.

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Windmuller whose telephone number is 703 305-4988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan Shoap can be reached on 703 308-1082. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 3724

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 872-9302 for regular communications and 703 308-9302 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-1148.

jw 
April 30, 2003.


Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700